

ordinating Committee version provides that the "treaty shall come into force between the states that have ratified or adhered to it" and that the Center shall "begin to perform its duties when five instruments of ratification or adherence" have been deposited. The Brazilian Article 22 calls for universal adherence before the treaty takes effect. It provides that the nuclear free zone will only enter into being after (a) all the Latin American states have joined; (b) all states controlling territory in the Western Hemisphere south of the 30th parallel have signed and ratified the Protocol of Additional Guarantees II which is annexed to the treaty; and (c) all the nuclear powers have signed and ratified the Protocol of Additional Guarantees I, in which they pledge to respect the denuclearized zone.

Corresponding to the differences in Article 22, the Brazilian version of Article 25 provides that authentic texts of the treaty must be written in Russian and Chinese, as well as in Spanish, Portuguese, English and French, as called for in Article 25 of the Coordinating Committee draft.

Effectively, what the differences boil down to is that under the Coordinating Committee version, a "nuclear free zone" would come into being even if only two countries ratified the treaty; whereas no such sub-regional "zone" could be established under the Brazilian draft.

Other amendments were offered by various countries to portions of the draft treaties where Brazil and Mexico were in accord. These amendments are to be considered, along with the two drafts, at the forthcoming session of Copredal.

Venezuela put forward two amendments, one regarding the right of transit and the other strengthening the role of the OAS. In the Mexican and Brazilian versions, each Latin American state may decide for itself whether or not to permit foreign-owned nuclear weapons to pass through its territorial air or waters; and in non-territorial sea or airspace there would be no prohibition of transit. One Venezuelan amendment would add to the treaty a clause banning the passage of all atomic weapons through the Latin American nuclear free zone. The second Venezuelan amendment would give greater responsibility for inspection and sanctions to the OAS, without entirely replacing the IAEA and the UN.

A Uruguayan amendment sought to reinforce the notion of a true atom free zone. In the Brazilian and Coordinating Committee texts, the denuclearization treaty would take force in the area made up of the sum of the territories of the signatory states. The Uruguayan proposal, applying a concept similar to that of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, would establish a definite geographical zone, with the perimeter extending into the oceans, which all states, Latin American and extra-continental would be obliged to respect.

These different proposals envisage distinct concepts of what exactly is a nuclear free zone. Since Latin America is the first region of the world to attempt to establish such a zone, there are no precedents to go by.

V. PROSPECTS

The fourth session of the Preparatory Commission will probably determine whether the hopes expressed in the UN and in Latin America for the denuclearization of the continent can be realized in the face of the numerous obstacles and differences of opinion that have arisen.

Much depends on the fate of the Latin American effort. If it succeeds, it is possible that other regions of the world—such as Scandinavia and Africa—may be motivated to overcome the problems that lie in the way of denuclearizing their areas. The techniques of building and inspecting future nuclear free zones, if any, could well be in-

fluenced by the pattern established in Latin America.

Unfortunately, the prospects for rapid establishment of a nuclear free zone encompassing all of Latin America are not bright. In addition to the difficulties discussed above, there are new problems that are just beginning to be thought about by Latin Americans. One involves a possible conflict between a nuclear free zone and the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. What would happen, for example, if in the event of war between the US and the Soviet Union, the US sought permission to base a Polaris submarine in Montevideo? Under the Rio Treaty, the Uruguayan government is bound to assist the US in fighting the extra-continental enemy; yet a denuclearization treaty would prevent Uruguay from having Polaris submarines stationed in its territory. Which of the two treaties would take precedence?

Another consideration is the related question of whether a Latin American nuclear free zone would have any meaning except in peacetime. In the event of atomic war, the Panama Canal would certainly be one of the first targets hit—nuclear free zone or not. Thus, one of the purposes of a nuclear free zone—reducing the incentive of the nuclear powers to strike—is probably meaningless insofar as Panama is concerned. Moreover, in world war, no area of the earth would be free from hostile action between the combatants; and in the event of atomic war, the shifting clouds of radioactive fallout would spare few if any countries.

Even in peacetime, prohibition of transit, as proposed by Venezuela, would be effectively impossible to enforce due to the opposition of the nuclear powers. So too, it would seem, would be the type of geographically delimited zone advocated by Uruguay. The US and Great Britain have shown no indication of willingness to surrender the traditional right of transit of their nuclear bombers, missiles or submarines across the high seas or through the Panama Canal. Moreover, it would be unrealistic to expect that Soviet submarines with Polaris-type missiles would respect a Latin American "order" to keep out of a geographical zone which extended onto the high seas.

The somewhat more realistic Brazilian draft treaty, without the Venezuelan or Uruguayan amendments, would also seem to have slight chances of success at this time. The chief reason here is the impasse over Cuban, French, Soviet and probably Chinese participation. As long as President Charles de Gaulle continues to pursue his independent nuclear policy, there is scant likelihood that France will include its Western Hemisphere possessions in the treaty or guarantee to refrain from atomic testing. Nor is the regime of Fidel Castro about to rush into a treaty which would preclude the possibility of ever again wielding Soviet or Chinese nuclear arms. (It is to be noted that the Mexican argument with regard to Cuba is that the island is to all intents and purposes permanently denuclearized because the US would never permit hostile missiles to be based 90 miles from its shores.) Castro has said he would sign a formal denuclearization treaty if the US withdraws from Guantánamo and includes Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Panama Canal Zone in the atom-free area. The US position, expressed by the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, William C. Foster, is that "we do not wish to have included in the proposed nuclear free zone the Virgin Islands, since it is U.S. territory, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, because of its integral relationship with the US. In the case of both these areas, the US must deal with disarmament policies affecting other powers. From the US point of view, we would be agreeable to inclusion of the Panama Canal Zone, although of course the well-established transit rights

would not be affected by the establishment of the proposed nuclear free zone. We could also agree to include Guantánamo if Cuba participates."¹⁶

Thus, at the very least, adoption of the Brazilian position at the next session of Copredal would mean that a Latin American nuclear free zone would have to wait for (1) the departure of President De Gaulle; (2) a drastic change in US policy; and/or (3) a change of government in Cuba.

Even if the Brazilian position does get a majority at the next session of the Preparatory Commission, the Mexicans appear to be determined to push ahead. The advantage of the Mexican treaty is that it permits some type of agreement—even if it is a very limited one—to go into force. Mexico could probably get the signatures of Chile, Ecuador, and some of the Caribbean and Central American republics. This would establish the Inter-American Denuclearization Center and leave the door open for future adherents. Mexican diplomats, who are on fairly good terms with Cuba, would attempt to persuade Castro to join. But without Cuba, and probably without Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela and Colombia (the four Latin American countries with reactors), the Mexican plan would hardly lead to a "Latin American" nuclear free zone. The "zone" might not even be contiguous geographically.

The question would then be, would this type of "nuclear free zone" be a success or a failure? The Brazilians, the US and the other nuclear powers would probably pay little attention to a "baby" or non-contiguous Latin American nuclear free zone. And clearly, by itself, a denuclearization treaty between Mexico, Chile, Haiti, El Salvador and a few other small republics would not have much meaning. Yet, given the circumstances, it might be a good beginning.

The Moscow Treaty banning atmospheric tests was signed despite the fact that underground tests were not prohibited, and without the adherence of two of the five nuclear powers. Thus, an arms control treaty need not be—in fact, most likely cannot be—perfect and universal when signed. Possibly diplomacy and the force of world opinion could be brought to bear on Brazil, Argentina and ultimately Cuba to join the denuclearization organization created by a Mexican-type treaty. At the very least, if a full-fledged nuclear free zone could not be set up, what might result would be a regional, verified non-proliferation treaty which would assure that Latin America's resources would not be wasted on a senseless atomic arms race.

(Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. LAIRD'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

UN ICE OF SPADES PROVING EFFECTIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE AMMUNITION IN VIETNAM

(Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7 I spoke in this House on the need to utilize psychological warfare against the enemy in the war in Viet-

¹⁶ Letter from Foster to the President of Copredal, December 10, 1965.

June 14, 1966

nam. My remarks are found at page 2303 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Even before I spoke our colleague from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] arose to ridicule my ideas. Their remarks are found at pages 2195 and 2285, respectively, of the same day's RECORD.

Since that time certain events have transpired which seem to bear out, from the standpoint of practical experience, the recommendations which I made. Fighting men in Vietnam from their own experience know that the superstitions of the enemy can be used against him. On their own they could not finance and carry out some of the suggestions for spooking the Vietcong which I made, but one they could. That was to confront him as much as possible with the ace of spades, a deadly bad luck symbol in that area of the world.

Noting a brief item in the Wall Street Journal that the U.S. Playing Card Co. had been furnishing thousands of these cards free to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam who requested them, I wrote the president of the company, Mr. Allison F. Stanley, and received the following letter together with several of its enclosures and enclosures to the enclosures as follows:

THE UNITED STATES PLAYING CARD CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 7, 1966.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: I certainly appreciate your letter of June 2, which has to do with the small part we played in the psychological warfare in Vietnam by sending aces of spades from our Bicycle playing cards. Candidly, I wish that our organization could take credit for the original idea. We cannot. The only thing we did was to carry through on the idea and be of assistance to the men who are fighting the war in Vietnam.

With the fear of boring you, I am going to give you a picture of what has happened, to illustrate how the idea has stimulated the imagination of not only the soldiers but many, many citizens who read in the newspapers what was being done. I believe you pointed out the psychological angle of the use of the ace of spades in February. As I recall it, I read your talk in the local paper.

On February 28, as you probably have seen, Newsweek had quite a story on the ace of spades incident. We were interested but did not know what to do as it might have the tinge of a publicity campaign put on by this Company. That is far from fact, even though we had a great deal of favorable comment on what we have done.

On February 16, 1966, we received a letter written from Vietnam on February 12. This letter was signed by four Lieutenants. Enclosed is a photostatic copy of this letter which I think you will find interesting. From that point on I have dealt with Lieutenant Charles W. Brown, who seemed to be the one handling the matter.

We immediately sent one thousand aces of spades and received a fine letter of appreciation from him. He could not reply promptly because he had been out on the battle fields for a period of time and did not have access to facilities for writing and mailing an acknowledgment. Also, he sent me a copy of a newspaper clipping from Saigon. I had a typewritten copy made of this, as it was difficult to photostat, and also copy of Lieutenant Brown's letter of May 7.

Next I received a letter from Private First-class John M. Redmond, photostat of which I am also enclosing.

The wire service got hold of the ace of

spades story and our local paper, The Cincinnati Enquirer, called me one night and asked me to verify it, which I did. Since then I believe it has been used in probably most of the leading newspapers in the country. As an example, I am enclosing a photostatic copy of clipping from The Florida Times-Union with copy of the letter from the shareholder of our Company who sent it to me. You will notice in the write-up that you were given proper credit.

The ace of spades story appeared in color on WLW-TV and the reporter who interviewed me on this incident suggested that the story be called our "Secret Weapon".

Since you are from the great State of California, I thought you would be interested in a letter I received from Mr. and Mrs. Henry Frese, 8441 Santa Margarita Lane, La Palma, California, 90620. I do not know this couple. I am enclosing a copy of Mr. and Mrs. Frese's letter, as you may wish to write them.

To show you to what extent parents will go to help their sons, I received a letter yesterday from another Californian—Mr. E. Dieckmann, Jr., 79 Rivo Alto Canal, Long Beach 3, California—telling me that his son was in the Marines at Da Nang, Hill 327, and asking if he could buy fifty-two of the aces of spades to send on to his son. He cannot buy them from us because we give them free, and his son's package is on its way. Also enclosed is a photostatic copy of Mr. Dieckmann's letter. I believe you will agree with me that such a letter from a father is really of human interest.

In addition to putting the aces of spades on the bodies of the enemy, I am told—and I cannot verify this—that the soldiers intend to stencil the ace of spades on their armaments. I presume this is done for good luck plus the fact that enemies capturing the equipment will be afraid to use it.

As you know, we are not making any charges for our service to the soldiers and we have no intention of doing so. Personally, I answer every letter I receive, whether it be from a soldier or an individual, telling them of our policy and our desire to be helpful.

Attached are several Bicycle aces of spades to give you some idea of what is being used. Incidentally, your newsletter on the ace of spades was excellent and we appreciate the credit you gave our Company.

If I can give you any further information, please let me know and I will do my best. I hope I have not made this letter too long or that it will bore you. If so, just throw it away.

Thank you for your interest in the matter and good luck to you in your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

ALLISON F. STANLEY.

FEBRUARY 12, 1966.

DEAR SIR: We, the officers of Company "C", 2d Battalion, 35th Infantry, 25th Infantry Division, are writing to ask a favor of the U.S. Playing Card Company.

We are stationed in Pleiko, South Vietnam and have been using your aces of spades as our calling cards for nearly two months. In Vietnam, the ace of spades and pictures of women are regarded as symbols of bad luck. Since your trade mark contains both of these, we have been leaving them in areas we have cleared of Viet Cong as a psychological weapon.

Our supply of cards is rapidly being depleted and we were wondering if you could supply us with approximately 1000 aces of spades. Your support would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Lt. BARRIE E. ZAIS,
Lt. LEONARD D. DAVIS,
Lt. CHARLES W. BROWN,
Lt. THOMAS R. WISSINGER,

Officers of Co C 2d Bn 35th Inf; 3d Bde
25th Inf. Div., APO San Francisco
96225.

Mr. ALLISON F. STANLEY,
President, The United States Playing Card
Co., Cincinnati, Ohio

DEAR Mr. STANLEY: This article was recently published in the "Tropic Lightning News," the official newspaper of the 25th Inf. Div. Another article has been written for the "Stars and Stripes." This is the newspaper that serves all Armed Forces personnel serving in the Pacific Theater of Operations.

I thought you might be interested in this article and want to pass it on to Mr. Powers. I'm sorry but they wouldn't mention the name of your company.

In the near future I may have to ask for more spades but at the present time we still have a couple of hundred left. We are trying to take some pictures to send you but as you might guess it is difficult to carry a camera on some of our operations.

Thank you again for your cooperation. I hope to hear from you in the future.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. BROWN,
21st Infantry.

P.S.—Did Bob Considine use our story in his column? If so each of us would like to have a copy if you could obtain them. Thank you.

ACES HIGH—KNOCK VC LOW

(NOTE.—This article, published in "Tropic Lightning News", sent in by Lt. Charles W. Brown to Mr. Allison F. Stanley, The United States Playing Card Co.)

The officers of Company C, 2nd Battalion, 35th Infantry, have more than a mere ace up their sleeves. To be exact, they each carry 12 aces—all spades.

A newspaper column they read mentioned that the Viet Cong, normally superstitious, were especially leary of the ace of spades. The men quickly decided to launch their own campaign of psychological warfare.

Wherever the men hit, they leave behind them several aces of spades tacked up in a prominent place.

The company was quick to take to their new symbol. The only problem was where to get enough of the playing cards so each man would have an adequate supply. A letter sent to the president of a major playing card company in the States soon resulted in a shipment of a thousand black aces being hauled off to Vietnam.

Each man now wears an ace of spades on each side of his helmet and they are planning to have an ace of spades stencil made for the butts of their weapons.

No VC were available for comment on the company's new symbol. They were last seen headed away from a jungle trail of aces of spades.

DEAR SIR: My name is John M. Redmond I am in the United States Army over in Vietnam. I read an article in the newspaper about the Viet-Cong's being superstitious of the black ace of spade. My buddy's and I decided to go together and buy about 1,000 ace of spade. Everytime we run into some Viet-Congs and kill them. We are going to place a couple of aces around the Viet-Congs. We would like for you to send the cards Cash On Delivery if possible. If you cannot send them C.O.D., just send us the price.

My address: P.F.C. John M. Redmond Co "A" 4Bn. 23 Inf., 25 Div., 1st BDE, Task Forces, APO, San Francisco, Calif. # 96225

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. REDMOND.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,

June 4, 1966.

DEAR Mr. STANLEY: Please find herewith the front page of the Florida Times Union (our morning paper) of June 3, 1966.

We were sorry to learn of your loss of a son in World War II.

We feel that regardless of reasons—your sending the aces of spades to Viet Nam is to the very best interests of all concerned.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RUTH F. ULBICH.

[From the Florida Times Union, June 3, 1966]
PSYCHOLOGICAL WEAPON: ACE OF SPADES GOES TO WAR IN VIET NAM

WASHINGTON, June 2.—With the help of a businessman whose son was killed in World War II, American servicemen in Viet Nam are fighting the Viet Cong with a psychological weapon spurned by the Pentagon and ridiculed by some Congressmen.

The weapon is a playing card, the ace of spades, which American fighting men are spreading by the thousands through Viet Cong-infested territory in their operation against the Reds.

The aces of spades, which the Vietnamese fear as an omen of death, are being supplied to the servicemen free of charge and unofficially by a playing card company in Cincinnati.

A spokesman for the company said that last Feb. 12, Allison F. Stanley, president of the firm, got a letter from four infantry lieutenants from the 25th Division operating in the Pleiku area explaining the psychological significance of the act of spades and asking for 1,000 cards "to leave in the areas we've cleared of the VC."

He said Stanley, who lost a son in World War II, ordered the cards sent free of charge.

The company, he continued, soon began to get other requests. One such request asked for the cards so that the servicemen could leave one on the body of each Viet Cong they killed and offered to pay for them. They were sent free.

The spokesman added that Stanley has since learned that soldiers in the 25th Division have begun wearing the cards on their helmets.

In all, several thousand of the cards have been sent to Viet Nam, the spokesman said.

The news that the men in Viet Nam were using the ace of spades against the enemy came as a pleasant surprise to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California.

Last Feb. 7 he suggested on the floor of the House that the Pentagon adopt the ace of spades as a psychological weapon.

His suggestion was greeted by silence from the Pentagon and jeers from colleagues in the House, particularly Representative WAYNE HAYS, Democrat, of New Jersey, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

"This indicates," HOSMER said today, "that at least the men in the field know what kind of ammunition they need and that part of that ammunition is psychological."

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,

June 6, 1966.

ALLISON F. STANLEY,
President, United States Playing Card Co.,
Cincinnati, Ohio

DEAR MR. STANLEY: After reading in Saturday's Los Angeles Times about your sending playing cards to our fighting men in Vietnam, I decided that the best way to show my thanks to you and your company was to support your company by purchasing cards made by you. I also mean to spread the word among my friends and card playing acquaintances.

In checking our local stores, I have found that they stock a multitude of playing cards under various brand names but I cannot find cards specifically marked United States Playing Card Company. I have asked that they stock them, but in thinking about it, it dawned on me that you might manufacture under a series of brand names which I know nothing about.

Might I receive a list of brand names which your company uses in distributing the cards? Also, do you manufacture plastic cards? I would like to arrive at bridge parties with full data regarding your products. I feel sure that some of those people present would feel as I do about your kind gesture and remember your brand names when they next purchased playing cards.

Again, my thanks to you and your company.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT E. JONES.

cc/Representative CRAIG HOSMER
My personal thanks to you too, Representative HOSMER—R.E.J.

LA PALMA, CALIF.,

June 6, 1966.

DEAR MR. STANLEY: Having at 9:00 a. m. just completed the reading of your "ace in the hole" contribution to our boys, my husband and I wish to be counted among your supporters.

Thank you, from the bottom of our hearts. We feel very deeply about our boys needing support over there. Incidentally we are a couple in our late twenties so don't give up hope for our mixed up generation.

Again sincere thanks.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HANK FRESE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,

June 4, 1966.

DEAR MR. STANLEY: Have just read of your distribution of the ace of spades in Vietnam.

My son, P.F.C. Chris Dieckmann, is with the Marines at Da Nang, Hill 327.

Could you send me one pack of 52 cards—all the ace of spades?

Money order enclosed, return mail. Let me know how much.

Please send to me and I will then send to my son with the clipping from the newspaper as explanation, although he has probably heard of its use already.

This is a great thing—and shows that Communism no matter or how brutal, cannot erase basic superstition from the minds of a people!

ED DIECKMANN, JR.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter to me, together with its enclosure of an item from the Kansas City Star, should also be of interest in connection with this subject:

CORONADO, CALIF.,

June 5, 1966.

DEAR SIR: This article seems to bear out exactly what you are advocating. For the life of me I can't understand why those who could help the war in this unconventional way don't "turn-to" and carry out your ideas. Chances are this particular incident was triggered by a reference to your beliefs. Damn it, it is an unconventional war so why not treat it as such! Good luck in your fight!

Sincerely,

Mrs. JANICE BURNS.

[From the Kansas City Star, June 1, 1966]

"THE BULLET" FOREBODES EVIL TO RED GUERRILLAS

WICHITA.—To a poker player, the ace of spades is "the bullet." To a fortune teller it's bad luck. To the Viet Cong it's terror.

A Wichita soldier serving in Vietnam has learned it pays to have an ace of spades up his sleeve, on his helmet, rifle or anywhere else when the Viet Cong are around.

Frankie Gene Willard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Willard, Wichita, recently wrote his parents that he and some of his buddies have discovered the Viet Cong have an unexplained fear of the ace of spades.

Wherever Willard and the other members of Company C, 2nd Battalion, 35th Infantry hit, they leave several aces tacked to trees and buildings.

The company was quick to take to their new symbol, Willard said. The only problem was finding enough cards for each man to have an adequate supply.

A letter sent to the president of a major playing card company in the United States resulted in a shipment of 1,000 black aces.

Each man now wears an ace of spades on each side of his helmet and is having them stenciled on weapons and equipment.

Whether the black ace symbolizes death of a friend, emotional strain and bad dreams as well as bad luck, or some special Oriental horror to the Viet Cong is not known.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for those in the White House and in the Department of Defense who are assuming to tell the military how to run this war to pay some attention to the matter of including psychological as well as explosive in our arsenal.

CONTE SEEKS VOTERS' VIEWS

(Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep myself fully informed of the views of those whom I represent in Congress, I recently circulated a questionnaire asking my constituents to express their opinions on 43 questions in 5 major areas of legislative concern. The results are in, and I would like to share them with my colleagues in the House.

Perhaps the most striking fact revealed by the questionnaire is a widespread uncertainty among the people concerning America's involvement in Vietnam. Although fewer of my constituents who responded favor withdrawal from Vietnam—22.6 percent—than favor escalation of bombing—44.7 percent—there is an unusually high percentage who recorded "no opinion" on these questions. Asked if they would favor a coalition government for South Vietnam, 42.9 percent, or close to half, had no opinion.

On the significant question of whether or not to maintain our present position in Vietnam, the response was 36.6 percent "yes," 31.5 percent "no," and 31.9 percent "no opinion."

The high percentage of "no opinion" answers to Vietnam questions did not carry over into other categories. On the question of continued U.S. opposition to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, for example, only 8.1 percent of those who answered had no opinion, while 53.5 percent voted in favor of continued U.S. opposition.

In other categories dealing with current issues before the country, 60.4 percent voted against an expansion in the war on poverty, and 63.4 percent expressed dissatisfaction with President Johnson's handling of the poverty program.

On the labor front, 65.3 percent opposed repeal of the Taft-Hartley 14(b) right-to-work provision, and 73.3 percent

expressed approval of Federal legislation to prevent strikes in essential industries.

My colleagues in the House will doubtless be pleased at the response to one question in particular. A majority of 62.2 percent of my constituents who answered favor a 4-year term for Congressmen, while only 20.3 percent disagree with this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased by the prompt response to my questionnaire and by the obviously careful consideration given to the questions I posed. The

tabulated results are both helpful and encouraging. They have given me a reading of the feelings of my voters on a wide range of subjects, and on some of these I had not received a great deal of mail. And they have also given me assurance and support for votes I have cast in this Congress and favorable reactions to legislation I have introduced in the House in recent months.

The questionnaire was sent to more than 30,000 residents of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts;

about 15 percent of those responded. I am told by the American Political Science Association that this is a well above average response. I am especially grateful to my friends at the University of Massachusetts who tabulated the individual responses for me. Because of the enormous demands on my regular staff, this helping hand was most welcome.

The complete questionnaire with percentage responses tabulated is shown below:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. In the light of our current position in South Vietnam, do you favor—			
(a) Gradual, complete withdrawal?	22.6	49.8	27.6
(b) Maintaining our present position, hoping to outlast our opposition?	36.6	31.5	31.9
(c) Blockading North Vietnamese ports?	55.9	15.3	28.8
(d) Bombing North Vietnam cities, including Hanoi, port of Haiphong, and main railroads leading to Red China?	44.7	25.8	29.5
(e) A coalition government in South Vietnam?	22.7	34.4	42.9
2. Do you favor allowing access to U.S. ports to ships of countries whose ships call at—			
(a) Red China?	25.8	62.5	11.7
(b) Cuba?	24.2	62.2	13.6
(c) North Vietnam?	19.8	66.9	13.3
3. Do you approve of continued U.S. opposition to the seating of Red China in the United Nations?	53.5	38.4	8.1
4. Do you favor a continuation of our present foreign aid program:			
(a) Economic?	56.3	32.7	11.0
(b) Military?	48.6	34.7	16.7
5. Should we spend our time and money trying to introduce some birth control methods in rapidly growing countries such as India and Brazil under our foreign aid program?	64.1	24.4	11.5
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor the proposed administration bill for Federal regulation of firearms?	59.1	31.0	9.9
2. Do you favor a program of rental supplements to low-income families unable to obtain standard housing with their own income?	40.2	49.6	10.2
3. Do you favor the continuance of the broad scale of the Federal urban redevelopment program?	45.9	39.1	15.0
4. Do you approve of the way the Johnson administration is conducting the war on poverty?	20.4	63.4	16.1
5. Do you favor an expansion in the war on poverty?	25.9	60.4	13.7
6. Do you favor a cutback in the war on poverty?	47.2	35.0	17.8
7. Do you favor a large scale Federal-State program for construction of plants to take the salt out of sea water and make it drinkable?	62.5	22.7	14.8
8. Do you favor supervised hospital care of narcotic addicts instead of jail terms?	81.4	10.2	8.4
9. Do you favor a tax credit for firms which install antiwater pollution devices?	69.7	21.0	9.3
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal Government should provide money to large cities to help modernize their mass transit systems?	39.0	47.9	13.1
2. Do you favor greater executive and congressional control over the Federal Reserve activities than is now in effect?	23.9	47.3	28.8
3. Do you favor a program of returning to the States a percentage of the Federal taxes collected?	63.2	23.4	13.4
4. To meet the added costs of the war, do you favor—			
(a) Increased taxes, including excise taxes?	26.0	53.3	20.7
(b) Cutting back on domestic Great Society programs?	71.5	16.6	11.9
LABOR			
1. Should the Federal Government set standards for State compliance with the length and amount of benefit payments in unemployment compensation?	40.8	43.3	15.9
2. Should we repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which gives each State the right to determine its own position on "right-to-work" laws?	22.5	65.3	12.2
3. Do you favor an increase in the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour to—			
(a) \$1.35 an hour?	23.4	39.9	36.7
(b) \$1.50 an hour?	37.2	36.4	26.5
(c) \$1.75 an hour?	15.1	47.7	37.2
4. Do you favor extending such a minimum wage to—			
(a) Farm workers?	64.9	22.8	12.3
(b) Laundry employees?	67.9	18.0	14.1
(c) Tip employees?	35.6	45.5	18.5
5. Should Congress enact legislation curbing strikes in essential industries?	73.7	19.8	6.5
6. Should Congress enact legislation curbing strikes against State and local governments (i.e., New York transit strike)?	73.4	20.4	6.2
GENERAL			
1. Do you favor the Federal Government taking steps to withdraw gradually from farm price-support programs?	77.4	11.1	11.5
2. Should the space program be slowed down during periods of large budget deficits?	50.4	40.0	9.5
3. Do you favor a proposed 4-year term for Congressmen? (If yes, check (a) and/or (b)).			
(a) All elected during a presidential election year?	62.2	20.3	17.6
(b) 1/2 elected every 2 years?	20.2	25.6	50.2
4. Do you favor legislation allowing a State the right to apportion 1 house of its legislature on factors other than population?	54.6	9.2	36.2
5. Do you favor a National Teachers Corps to augment school facilities in impoverished areas?	36.6	36.5	27.0
	62.0	25.0	13.0

CANADA'S PRIME MINISTER SPEAKS OUT

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Lester B. Pearson, Saturday night called on the United States to take the lead in refash-

ioning the NATO alliance into an Atlantic Union and he warned against policies which might drive France still further into a position of isolation from other members of the Alliance.

He spoke in Springfield, Ill., under the sponsorship of Federal Union, Inc., a nonprofit nonpartisan membership group devoted to the Atlantic Union objective.

In his address he called upon the

United States to provide long-needed leadership in strengthening the Alliance, and he warned:

France, and not only France, feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough, (in large part because of the generous assistance of the U.S.A.) to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the Alliance.

Here is the text of this timely, significant, and brilliant message:

is to protect the public and to make sure the public is informed about what goes on. And we can't do it if the legal profession is going continually to harass us with new regulations and new proceedings which give judges almost a mandate to muzzle the press. It is a fight that affects every newspaper in every city in America.

I don't for one minute condone trial by newspapers. But let's get one thing clear, let's get this straight: no civil right, including the right of a fair trial, is worth a tinkering's dam unless it is protected by the right of free expression. If an accused man can't say his piece in court, cannot have lawyers and friends plead his case, what good is his so-called "civil right" to a fair trial? Without the right of free expression, justice would deteriorate into a tragic comedy. When these two amendments clash—and it seems they clash only when publicity-seeking lawyers stage the collision—the First Amendment must take precedence over the Sixth Amendment, because without the First Amendment, the Sixth Amendment would become a mockery of justice.

Thank God we have in America hundreds of judges in the high courts and in the lower courts, many of them in this state, who realize that freedom of expression is the fundamental right of all liberty.

The world of 1966, like Peter Zenger's world of 1735, is still engaged in mortal combat with those who would be free and those who would deny freedom to others; those who believe people should have access to the facts and those who are convinced they know what is best for you and for me. So long as the forces of freedom exist, we who are privileged to be part of those forces must resist arbitrary power and secrecy wherever and whenever it appears. We must take our stand on behalf of the people, all the people. It is the only choice for those who cherish freedom and justice. Liberty can be destroyed by tyrannical government and tyrannical courts if the people can be threatened or persuaded to abandon free speech and a free press. Newspapers defend the right of individuals against the entrenched power of arrogant abuse by public officials. They fight to bring the truth to light; to support justice and oppose injustice; to make certain that every individual is treated equally before the law; to make certain that every American can speak his piece without fear or favor. Today the United States is the last great bastion of liberty in the world, and a free press in America is the last great bastion of the people against complete domination by government.

If newspapers will recognize their responsibility, as well as their opportunity, to print the truth; refuse to be intimidated; refuse to bow to government bureaucracy; then they will serve the highest cause of civilization, which is individual freedom, the freedom of choice and the right of free expression. As partners in freedom, the people and the press in America can save liberty.

Without the right of freedom for the individual, without the right of free expression for everyone, there can be no lasting or satisfying progress for us in America. This is the freedom we must cherish, this is the freedom we must fight for, this is the freedom—if necessary—we must go to jail to preserve. We must cherish it and hold it the dearest thing in life, because if America maintains its freedom, then sometime, somehow, America, being free, will show the rest of the world the road to freedom. This I believe, my friends, is the divine mission of America—freedom for ourselves and eventually freedom for all the world.

And because it is our special mission we should remind ourselves every morning that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

In closing, I want to salute the University of Arizona for its vision and wisdom in recognizing the great contribution Peter Zenger and his wife Anna made to the cause of freedom. And again a thousand grateful thanks for this award.

Good luck and God bless all of you.

(Mr. SAYLOR was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. SAYLOR was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SAYLOR'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LACK OF CHECKS AND RESTRAINTS ON PROFITEERING IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following interesting report with respect to the conflict in Vietnam:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 8, 1966]

CONGRESSMEN SEE U.S. AID DOLLARS STRAYING IN VIETNAM (By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—Few businessmen in the world are hauling in as much profit as those in Saigon.

Business there is booming.

But Congress is beginning to wonder if it should be quite so good.

In fact, members of a special congressional delegation just returned from Vietnam are raising serious questions about the lack of checks and restraints on profiteering carried out by Vietnamese businessmen at the direct expense of American taxpayers.

The basic problem stems from the vast American aid program.

Since 1955, the United States has pumped some \$1.7 billion worth of consumer goods into Vietnam under its commodity import program (CIP). This amounts to 80 percent of all nonmilitary aid sent to that country in that period.

FINAL USE QUESTIONED

This program allows Saigon businessmen on license by the South Vietnamese Government to contract for goods with American businessmen, import the goods to Vietnam, then pay for them in dollars, the local currency. American aid dollars are used to reimburse the American businesses, and the dollars used to pay for the goods go into a joint United States-Vietnamese account.

The aim of the program is to stem inflation while promoting economic stability in the country.

But members of the House foreign operations and government information subcommittee found that CIP money is virtually subsidizing some 40 to 50 big businessmen in Saigon. Furthermore, there is practically no control over the final use of the goods. Subcommittee members believe that some of these goods are being resold to the Viet Cong, the North Vietnamese, and even the Chinese Communists. Unfortunately, restraints are so slack, there is no way of knowing for sure.

BUSINESSMEN PROFIT

Here are some of the findings which deeply disturb some individual members of the subcommittee:

The exchange rate set for the CIP program is 60 piasters to the dollar. The official rate is 118 to the dollar, and the blackmarket rate is 190 to 200.

This means United States taxpayers are getting about 30 cents of real value out of every dollar spent. Saigon businessmen pocket the difference. It also means these businessmen can resell the goods for terrific profits—for dollars or even gold.

There is no check on the appropriate amount of a specific item imported into Vietnam, and there is no way of checking what it will be used for—there is no "end use audit" procedure. Here are two recent blatant examples of what this can mean:

Subcommittee members learned that about 15 times the amount of silver nitrate which South Vietnam could possibly use went into that country last year.

SHIPMENTS HALTED

Likewise, about 10 times the amount of another chemical, unicef, which could possibly be used in their country was sold to Saigon businessmen.

Both these chemicals can be broken into ingredients for high explosives. And the silver can be extracted from silver nitrate for hoarding. Shipments of these two chemicals have been halted now, according to officials of the Agency for International Development (AID). Congressmen suspect much of these chemicals ended up in Viet Cong hands.

The United States and South Vietnam Governments knew practically nothing about the Vietnamese businessmen who hold the CIP licenses. United States officials lack basic knowledge, for example, of whether they are Chinese or Vietnamese in background or what their business connections are.

SUGGESTIONS VETOED

Goods originally ordered by businessmen can be turned down on arrival and not paid for. South Vietnam officials then confiscate them, auction them off at "a very reduced rate"—and the money then goes into the South Vietnam coffers, not into the joint United States-Vietnamese account. One subcommittee member pointed out that the Viet Cong could be buying these goods at auction—because there is no check on who buys them.

The joint United States-Vietnamese account, into which Vietnamese businessmen pay piasters for the goods, was intended to be used for United States civil-aid projects. Also, an agreed amount supports the South Vietnamese governmental budget. But, in effect, the government of South Vietnam exercises a veto over the use of these funds so completely that the aims of the civil-aid projects are seriously frustrated.

Recent examples of projects the United States Embassy was pushing but which failed to gain approval of the South Vietnamese Government include: use of the funds to pay for garbage collection in Saigon, to build police barracks, and to establish a fund from which to pay Vietnamese claims against the United States.

One subcommittee member called the failure of United States controls over this program a "windfall" for Saigon businessmen.

REPORTS WITHHELD

Another member of the delegation, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, now Republican Senator from Michigan, was blunt in his observations. "What we saw over there is a situation where Saigon businessmen have a vested interest in the prolongation of the war," he charged in an interview.

The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Rep. JOHN E. MOSS (D) of California,

is preparing a report on its findings. No one can say what its final shape will take since it has not been completed. But it will probably place strong blame for the slack program on both AID officials and on the General Accounting Office (GAO), charged with the responsibility to double-check the administration of government programs all over the world.

STAFF INCREASED

One subcommittee member charged that AID administrators in Washington "simply couldn't answer basic questions about their programs. That's why we went to Vietnam." He said they found that AID officials in Vietnam were simply holding onto the audit reports to update them. "They were never sent to Washington." No wonder Washington officials couldn't answer questions, he observed.

Subcommittee members are especially disturbed about what they see as dangerous understaffing of the CIP program, especially in accounting and auditing.

In the 10-month period between June, 1965, and April, 1966, the number of AID personnel increased from 630 to 1,900. But until the past few months, only two of these employees were principally concerned with the CIP. A year ago, only one American was in charge. Now, after the subcommittee began investigations seven or eight months ago, the number has increased to seven.

Yet, this year \$370 million out of a total AID commitment of \$630 million, went to the CIP.

The only formal report issued by the GAO on governmental programs in Vietnam in the past seven years came in 1964. Then the GAO, which is an independent arm of the Congress, set up in 1921 to ride herd on the administration, charged that AID was operating under completely inadequate procedures—that nonessential commodities were being admitted into the CIP, that profiteering and overpricing were being allowed.

"Yet, in spite of this report, AID conducted no audit until we got there," said one delegation member.

INADEQUACY CHARGED

Rutherford M. Poats, director of AID for the Far East, says the procedures are still "not adequate."

He said they have steadily expanded the AID auditing staff to 17. He conceded, however, that seven of those were trainees.

He said AID had increased the authorized positions to 26, but that since Vietnam is such a dangerous place, it is very hard to get auditors to go there. AID now is "ordering them from other AID missions around the world by forced draft to go to Vietnam."

Another problem is getting local Vietnamese for the staff. "We can't pay more than the local wages. We've lost some key people to private business which can pay much more."

Still there is no "end use" auditing procedure.

GAO officials admit that after the 1964 report they had "no one physically in Vietnam," until "a team of four people" went there briefly this spring. One congressional source said of the GAO: "They have been conspicuously absent in Vietnam."

Subcommittee members tend to excuse the GAO on the grounds that it has "no continuing responsibility" in any special area. Its investigations are made at the discretion of the comptroller general, and at the request of Congress.

PERMANENCY STUDIED

Yet, GAO officials themselves say that with the size of the program and the "tremendous expenditure," it might be useful to establish a permanent office there.

"The salutary effect of our presence could be a factor of some consequence," said an

official. But there are no plans to do this at present.

"We were aware that we had not covered anything there in a number of years," he said explaining the decision to investigate in 1964.

"But we have some reservations in deciding what practically can be accomplished in sending our people to Vietnam under wartime conditions. It might be a better idea to go other places where we could accomplish more," said an official of the GAO international operations division.

STAFF DIFFICULTIES

He also cited the difficulty in getting a staff overseas.

The total worldwide staff of GAO is about 2,000. The Far East headquarters in Hawaii has a staff of about 35. But GAO presently has no one in Vietnam, which has the largest United States AID program in the world.

Apparently, the subcommittee's investigation has set the ball rolling.

Since it started, the State Department's inspector general of foreign assistance and the AID comptroller have been to Vietnam. Also the director of foreign service personnel was scheduled to go.

But a more basic problem is pointed out by subcommittee member Rep. DONALD RUMSFELD (R) of Illinois: "As I look at it, I feel we lack leverage with the Government of South Vietnam."

He says he believes American officials are afraid to demand more controls.

Another subcommittee member agrees. Says Rep. DAVID S. KING (D) of Utah, "In theory, we can't go in to run the show."

But he asserts that this idea has been "used as a cloak to cover up a rather shoddy and unsatisfactory performance by the South Vietnamese Government."

Adds Mr. GRIFFIN: "My greatest criticism is that the very expensive CIP, so obviously susceptible to corruption and abuses, has been almost completely left in the hands of the Saigon government. We are justified in taking a stronger hand."

Whatever the final recommendations of the subcommittee will be, there are sure to be some strong recommendations for a greater United States role in overseeing the use of United States taxpayer's money. From what these congressmen say, such supervision barely exists at all today.

Total economic aid for fiscal 1967: 71% to South Vietnam; 29% to all others.

U.S. economic aid to South Vietnam

[In millions]

Fiscal 1963-----	\$143.6
1964-----	165.7
1965-----	224.9
1966-----	541.1
1967-----	550.0

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FARNUM (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for June 13, on account of illness.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia), for Tuesday, June 14, 1966, on account of official business.

Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McEWEN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for balance of week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 15 minutes, June 15; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MICHEL (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 30 minutes, June 20; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota), for 15 minutes, June 15; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. HICKS), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HEBERT and to include pertinent material on debate during H.R. 2950.

Mr. ICHORD to extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole following Mr. PRICE.

Mr. BENNETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina to include a statement by General Westmoreland at the beginning of his remarks made today in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YOUNGER.

Mr. MOORE in three instances.

Mr. BERRY in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN in three instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. ADAIR.

Mr. MIZE in two instances.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi.

Mr. MORSE in four instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. GROVER.

Mr. RUMSFELD.

Mr. REINECKE.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.

Mr. QUILEN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HICKS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. BLATNIK in five instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. GRABOWSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. RACE.

Mr. DYAL in four instances.

Mr. BOLAND in three instances.

June 14, 1966

It is not impossible at all that her efforts helped, in the end, when Bunn did let the youngster go. This will never be known, yet one thing will be: Mrs. LaForest, who may have known more than the others about the dangers involved, went willingly into the nightmare on Wildcat Mountain to do her part in the rescue.

It was Wilfred Morin, of course, who made the rescue and who made it under conditions of conspicuous great courage. Nocera had already been shot, and Morin knew that he, too, might be. But the Bristol dog warden and bartender was willing to face a very good possibility of death in order to persuade the crazed and trigger-happy Bunn to release his captive.

Thanks to Morin's ingenuity and his daring, the boy was saved. People do not come any braver than Morin. Unless there had been somebody there with Morin's selfless fortitude, even the best that the others could give might not have been enough.

That was a morning awful enough to make the whole community want to forget it as soon as possible. And we hope they can. But we hope, at the same time, that the brave people won't be forgotten. This is an age when he hear, too often, of people who "don't want to get involved"—people who turn their backs on fellow humans in terrible trouble. Last week in Burlington we all witnessed a fine demonstration of people who were "willing to get involved"—even if it meant getting killed.

It was fine demonstration. It makes a person proud to live near these people. It is people like this who make a town good. People like this make you know that there is somebody who will help.

Great Plains Program Tremendous Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly remarkable achievements in American agriculture in our time is the new look in the vast region of the Great Plains.

The change, in terms of greater agricultural stability, reduced soil erosion, development of water for agricultural and recreational uses, and a more beautiful landscape, has come about as a result of an enlightened partnership between people and their government, between scientist and landowners.

It has come about largely through the Great Plains conservation program, a tool that has been greatly sharpened and strengthened in the last 6 years under leadership that recognizes the fundamental role land resources plays in the well-being of an entire region.

What has happened in the Great Plains is more than simple recovery from years of drought and dust storms which, for a time, gave it the unhappy label of "The Dust Bowl."

Droughts will recur, for this is the nature of the climatic pattern of the Great Plains. Wind will blow, as it always has, across the rolling prairies.

But the farmer and rancher who has reserves of grass and water, who has tied down with grass his soils that are unsuited for cultivation, will not become the dispossessed migrant of the thirties.

These are the primary goals of the Great Plains conservation program—a program that has been expanded by 60 percent since 1960, to serve a larger member of landowners in the region each year.

"Wheat Will Win the War" was a battle cry during World War I, and the wheatlands of the Great Plains responded with heavy output. The plow-up was costly, however, for much of the newly cultivated land was extremely susceptible to the winds of the dry years that followed. The term "dust bowl" came out of the disaster.

The research scientist and the farmer have formed an effective partnership in solving the problems of the Great Plains. Techniques developed in times of drought and privation are the solid basis now for a far more stable agriculture in the plains. The survey of soils, classifying them as to their capability in conservation use, has provided unmistakable lines of guidance in adapting the lands of the Great Plains to agricultural production.

The technical help afforded by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, its effectiveness intensified by the forming of landowner-managed, State-sponsored soil conservation districts, became a useful tool for use by farmers and ranchers of the region in correcting errors of the past and in bringing their resources into fuller stability. In addition, Federal funds have been made available to defray part of the cost of land-use shifts and to step up the rate of conversion.

The program was authorized by Congress during the drought of the 1950's. It was conceived as a pilot program, a testing of principles developed for a particular region. It was accepted at first by a relatively few landowners, and from 1957 through 1960, received Federal cost-sharing appropriations of \$10 million each year. Beginning in 1961, however, the appropriation has been increased gradually to the current level of \$16 million and in recent years about 5,000 farmers and ranchers have entered the program each year.

Approximately 23,000 landowners have entered the program. Thousands have completed their work and have been enjoying the benefits of complete conservation treatment and sounder use of their resources. The size of the units range from small to large—an average of 1,900 acres.

The conversion of unsuitable cropland to permanent vegetative use was, at the outset, a principal objective. The results have been dramatic. More than 1,400,000 acres of these less stable lands have been returned to the protection of grass, or are in the process of being converted. This represents more than 1 acre in every 5 cropland acres involved in the 23,000 Great Plains contracts. Wheat produced on these acres was, in recent times, not only surplus to our needs but was

produced at the cost of damage to the land resource—a damage we cannot afford.

Grass and water are the earmarks of the new agriculture in the Great Plains. The Great Plains conservation program is enabling the landowners of the plains to have them—grass as productive as his land and skill in management can produce, and water enough to see him through the years of drought that he wisely presumes to be ahead. With grass and water in abundance, the producer no longer must dispose of livestock on a market glutted by the offerings of owners in the same distress.

The new agriculture in the Great Plains is built upon the conservation of soil and water resources, an approach that was born in times of land disaster and human hardship. The drought of the 1950's was less damaging than the one of the 1930's that aroused the Nation to action—less damaging because of conservation progress and know-how already moving into use across the plains. Because of work now being done by the region's landowners, much of it prompted and facilitated by agricultural programs supported by the Federal Government, less damage will occur in the plains' next drought. Whatever the future holds for plains agriculture, the farmers and ranchers of the region are in far better condition to cope with emergencies as they come.

Is United States Pleading Viet Case on Wrong Grounds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Howard K. Smith column which follows eloquently and accurately states the real reason for our commitment to and presence in Vietnam:

IS U.S. PLEADING VIET CASE ON WRONG GROUNDS?

(By Howard K. Smith)

Every successive opinion poll shows that our appetite for resisting in Viet Nam is declining, and that President Johnson's stock with the voters is going the same way.

One cannot help thinking that the administration is not putting its case to the American people in proper terms. Of several faults, one is outstanding: The President and Secretary of State Dean Rusk and their colleagues almost always justify our effort in Southeast Asia on legal or moral grounds. The fact is that the struggle there is essentially and overwhelmingly a power struggle which we would probably have to undertake regardless of law or morality.

This is not to agree with the host of guilt-ridden critics who believe our moral case is bad. Compared with our foe's case, it is downright good. Ho Chi Minh has never dared submit his regime to a free election such as we are pressing for under U.N. inspection in the south.

His instrument of power has been terrorism. His "reforms" left the average North Vietnamese peasant considerably worse off

June 14, 1966

A3197

board were pioneered by MFY people long before they became fashionable currency and lost their radical sting.

The real problem that confronts MFY was dramatized for this reporter in a teen service center on East 6th Street where youth worker Angel Camacho said bitterly:

"We get answers here for most of the problems the kids come in with, except the big one. We don't have enough jobs."

When all is said and done Mobilization is still dependent upon the workings of the American economy—increasingly automated, increasingly higher-skilled.

STATE OF MIND

"Poverty" is always a relative term. What we call "poverty" is sheer luxury for the peasant of India. Perhaps "poverty" is a state-of-mind, more than anything else. Perhaps "poverty" means a disintegration of self-esteem. And perhaps MFY's contribution, when the final score is totaled up, will be in the changing of that state-of-mind, the restoration of self-esteem.

That's the hope anyway. The alternative, a failure right across the board, raises alternatives almost too dreadful to contemplate.

The battle is being fought in the target area. There are little victories and defeats every day. The calculus of those victories and defeats will go a long way towards determining the American future.

The Spirit That Is America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 5, 1966, I attended a farewell party to a truly great individual, Rev. L. R. Boyll, minister of the Carpenter Memorial Methodist Church in Glen Cove, N.Y. A man who has inspired his fellow men and our community to mutual respect for each other and their individual beliefs—at the same time inspired a unity of purpose for all men.

The encomiums of praise heaped upon Reverend Boyll at this gathering cannot be lost, for they truly demonstrate the spirit that is America. Therefore, I enter in the *Record* the statements of three of his fellow clergymen, of different faiths, and the former mayor of Glen Cove, in praise of this great man:

Reverend Laurence Boyll's leaving is a real loss to our community. He has gained an enviable and well-deserved reputation both within and outside the Carpenter Memorial Methodist Church. His support has been essential for so many good causes in Glen Cove and vicinity.

He and Mrs. Boyll go with our good wishes and prayers for their future health and success.

Rabbi ALTON MEYER WINTERS,
North Country Reform Temples, Glen
Cove, N.Y.

Laurence Boyll is a loss to Glen Cove. He has taught men what it is to be men. He has taught dignity and restraint. I am proud to say that he has taught me, and I am grateful.

Rev. CHARLES KOHLI,
St. Patrick's, Glen Cove, N.Y.

Rev. Laurence Boyll and his queenly wife, Mrs. Rachel Boyll, will be greatly missed in Glen Cove. Words are inadequate to express what their friendship, love and fellowship has meant to our Church. Mrs. Galloway and the members of our Church join with me in wishing Rev. and Mrs. Boyll the blessings of God. Our thoughts and prayers will go with them as they leave for their new field of service. God bless them always.

Dr. B. A. GALLOWAY,
Calvary A.M.E. Church, Glen Cove, N.Y.

Rev. Boyll, it has been my pleasure and privilege to know you during your years of service to the people of Glen Cove and it is with heartfelt sadness that I learned you are leaving us.

During the days when I was Mayor of Glen Cove, I can recall so well the times you could be counted on to help our community. It was good to know Reverend Boyll was there to lend a wise, able and understanding hand.

A community seldom has too many citizens conscientious and willing to help in its growth and betterment. You were always one of our people and so your presence will be missed by many.

For your service as Chaplain to Glen Cove Volunteer Fire Department and your work on many committees responsible for bettering our housing conditions and community relations, you deserve the thanks of the entire community.

I am proud to know you and wish you continued years of wonderful service to the community to which you now go. We shall miss you but are grateful for all you have done for so many.

HON. JOSEPH REILLY,
Former mayor of Glen Cove, N.Y.

Flag Day 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, 1966, is Flag Day, and I am taking this opportunity to urge every American to display and proudly honor our flag.

The abuses that have been directed at our flag in the past year can best be rebuffed by every citizen showing deep respect and devotion to the symbol of our Nation and to the ideals for which it stands. This year a special effort should be made to observe Flag Day.

In concluding my brief remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the *Jonesboro, Tenn., Herald and Tribune*:

FLAG DAY

Speaking at the Flag Day celebration, Washington, D.C., on June 14, 1914, President Woodrow Wilson said,

"This flag for the future is meant to stand for the just use of undisputed national power. No nation is ever going to doubt our power to assert its rights, and we should lay it to heart that no nation shall henceforth doubt our purpose to put it to the highest uses to which a great emblem of justice and government can be put.

"It is henceforth to stand for self-possession, for dignity, for the assertion of the right of one nation to serve the other na-

tions of the world—an emblem that will not condescend to be used for purposes of aggression and self-aggrandizement; that it is too great to be debased by selfishness; that has vindicated its right to be honored by all nations of the world and feared by none who do righteousness."

Bravery in Burlington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the *Record* an editorial entitled "Bravery in Burlington" that appeared in the *Waterbury Republican* June 3, 1966. The editorial follows:

BRAVERY IN BURLINGTON

The abduction of a Terryville youngster by a demented and dangerous Burlington man last week might have turned into a terrible tragedy if it had not been for some people who were alert and generously responsible and extremely brave.

It is impossible to single out all the people who deserve to be commended, for there are many of them and the exceptional assistance they gave may never be known or acknowledged. The precise facts of an episode like this one are elusive, and the records are apt to omit the data most important to a true, full picture. Memories are short, and eyewitnesses do not all see the same thing. But there are at least six persons who obviously deserve special public praise.

We think a debt of gratitude is owed to George S. Grodecki and Donald Lassy, of Terryville, passers-by who became suspicious when they saw Albert Bunn Jr. stop his pick-up truck near a group of small children. Grodecki and Lassy slowed down to observe what was going on. They saw Bunn drag a six-year-old boy to his vehicle and drive off. Thanks to Grodecki and Lassy, who followed Bunn to Burlington, the police knew quickly where to go to begin the rescue.

It seems to us, also, Bristol Police Chief Robert Grace deserves a great deal of credit. He had to know that he was sending his men on a dangerous mission that could be ruled to be outside his area of jurisdiction. It is the kind of a decision that could backfire disastrously on the man who made it. But Chief Grace did not hesitate. He got his men out there fast and went to work. He didn't wait for the State Police, and it might have been calamitous if he had.

Bristol Patrolman Joseph Nocera, who was wounded when Bunn hit him with a bird-shot blast, is surely one of the heroes of the episode. He is lucky that he wasn't killed or that he wasn't injured more seriously. But his hurts and scars will testify to the fact that police work is dangerous work, indeed—that a policeman never knows when he may have to face an insane killer in the line of duty and take risks that can never be adequately compensated.

For bravery and a generous willingness to help, Mrs. Joan LaForest should be afforded warm public recognition, too. She was the sister of the man who had kidnapped the child, and the experience she was undergoing must have tortured her. But she volunteered to go up the hill with Officer Nocera to try to talk her brother into letting his little victim go free.

than the average South Vietnamese peasant—until Ho made life in the south impossible by the murder of nearly all local officials and the systematic intimidation of the rest. It is an eloquent fact that though war-weary South Vietnamese dissent or riot or desert the forces, none go over to the Viet Cong.

But the real and relevant explanation of why we are fighting is that this is a power struggle the loss of which would bring consequences awful to contemplate.

To make the point, consider what would happen, first if they, then if we, prevail.

A Communist success, following an American withdrawal, would be an "open-ended" result. It would sharpen their appetite and desperately weaken the resistance of neighbors waiting to be consumed. It would justify the basic motivation of their ideology which is blind faith in a world interpretation that promises universal dominion at the end of the road.

The "domino" theory is much discredited in conversation. But the facts of life are these: Laos and Cambodia are shot through with guerrilla forces trained where those now in South Viet Nam were trained. Our AID officials in Thailand are watching a guerrilla minority, trained in the same place, beginning to accumulate power by methods of pure terror in northeast Thailand.

China has made public the intention of adding Thailand to her bloc, and her actions over many years make clear her ultimate design of forcing the disintegration of India, the only possible counter-force to China south of Japan.

In short, a Communist success would be a destabilizing event; it would be bound to lead to further and worse conflicts.

A success for our side, on the other hand, would be a stabilizing result. As in Europe, we seek no territorial gain. Our aim is to find a line and establish the principle that we will not cross it to their detriment if they will not cross it either.

In the age of nuclear weapons it is a paramount mission to establish this principle that borders may not be changed by force in Asia—just as we established it in Europe. With China rapidly becoming a nuclear power, we dare not relinquish the effort now by curtailing our force or withdrawing it.

In his recent history of our times, Prof. Carroll Quigley makes the point that Germany, Italy and Japan gained immensely more by losing to us in World War II than they could have possibly have gained by winning. Had they won, their governments, filled with the seeds of their own degeneration, would have been stimulated to infinite acquisition, with consequent national impoverishment and eventual annihilation by the United States. As it is, they have stabilized, become progressive, democratic and prosperous societies.

Very much the same can be said about the Communist nations of Asia. If they win in Viet Nam, they will move on indefinitely to extend their sway. At some point the United States would be forced to intervene again, this time with the support of the opinion polls of a frightened public that at last would see the real nature of the struggle. A much bloodier war would result.

South Viet Nam is the right place and this is the right time to make a stand.

Irene Whisenant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Catawba County, N.C., and her

many friends in other sections of the country were shocked and saddened last week to learn of the tragic passing of Miss Irene Whisenant, a former employee of the House of Representatives. Miss Whisenant was killed in an automobile accident.

She served as private secretary to the late North Carolina Representatives Alfred L. Bulwinkle and Hamilton C. Jones. Miss Whisenant was a very capable young lady and performed her congressional duties in an outstanding manner.

Her life was characterized by a dedication to her family, her church, and to her work. She was a kind and understanding Christian lady whose sincere interest in people won the admiration and love of all those with whom she associated.

Miss Whisenant's many friends mourn her passing. An editorial in the June 10, 1966, edition of the Observer-News-Enterprise at Newton, N.C., very aptly describes the life and character of Miss Whisenant. Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Newton (N.C.) Observer-News-Enterprise, June 10, 1966]

IRENE WHISENANT

Miss Irene Whisenant was the kind of woman who instinctively liked people. As a member of the administrative staff of Davis Hospital in Statesville she was constantly doing things for the comfort of patients and friends.

She was forever running errands for patients because she wanted to. The longtime resident of Maiden was recognized by those who knew her as "a good woman" and "good friend."

Miss Whisenant's long career of public service stretched from the nation's capital to the Catawba Valley. She served Congressmen A. L. Bulwinkle and Hamilton C. Jones as a personal secretary.

Her last job—that at Davis Hospital—was perhaps even more rewarding for it meant helping people at close range. Each day she commuted between the home of her parents in Maiden and the Statesville hospital.

She often told friends she loved the job and the commuting too much to give up the job.

Tuesday she left home as usual and threaded her way down Highway 10 through Catawba. She was hardly outside of downtown Catawba when her car was caught up in an accident with a truck.

Two hours later Miss Whisenant became the county's 25th traffic fatality of the year. Catawba Countians who knew her will miss this rare woman who liked people so much.

The large concourse of friends and relatives from throughout the county attending the rites Thursday attest the high esteem in which she was held. Her pastor of First Methodist Church, of which she had served as a member of the official board, paid tribute to her loyalty to her church and friends, citing her exemplary life of service.

VFW Post in Claxton, Evans County, Ga., Promotes U.S. Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1966

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Flag Day, I want to take

this occasion to apprise my colleagues of an inspiring event which I attended on Memorial Day in Claxton, Ga.

When I accepted an invitation from the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post to participate in its Memorial Day program, little did I realize what an outstanding job this post was performing to encourage patriotism and respect for our national flag.

When I arrived in Claxton, I was pleasantly surprised to discover American flags flying everywhere. In asking who was responsible for this wonderful act of patriotism, I was advised that it was the result of a special project of the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post.

The post has purchased a number of American flags to be rented to local business houses, displayed on national holidays and properly stored when not in use for an annual cost of \$12 to each merchant. The post is also displaying the flag at prominent public buildings on a daily basis.

The Post Commander, D. B. Plyler, describes the project as follows:

This is not a money-making project, but is planned to display our National flag and help tell the American story to coming generations. Our flag represents free America, and all the things for which men have fought and died. We hope to help emphasize its importance in our Community.

When other civic and service clubs around the country are looking for project ideas, I heartily recommend that they follow the example being set by the Claxton-Evans County VFW Post. What better project can any club adopt than one which will encourage patriotism and respect for the American flag?

Australia and Edward Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of Texas' favorite sons, Austin attorney, Edward Clark, the American Ambassador to Australia, recently returned to this country for a brief visit.

He has been enthusiastically received by his friends, his law colleagues and fellow Texans and Americans.

He has also been honored by his college alma mater, Southwestern University in Georgetown, Tex. For his outstanding leadership and service to this country, he was presented an honorary doctor's degree, an honor, I might add, that has been justly earned by Mr. Clark, who has offered his dedicated and talented service to this country.

His sojourn to our shores also gave him an opportunity to speak about Australia before the Lions Club in his boyhood home of San Augustine, Tex.—a town that has been historically and traditionally noted for the outstanding leaders the area has produced, many of whom were prominent in the early development of Texas.

June 14, 1966

Mr. Clark's remarks before the club were timely, informative and appropriate. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following in the RECORD:

AUSTRALIA

(Address by the Honorable Edward Clark, American Ambassador to Australia, before the Lions Club, San Augustine, Tex., June 2, 1966)

It is a challenge to me to be asked to speak here today, because I feel I must not deal in platitudes. Through a lifetime of talking to people, I have found that the way to hold a demanding audience is to choose a subject that you know something about. So today I am going to talk about Australia—not a land of kangaroos and surfboards and naked Aborigines, but a young and vital nation that challenges the United States to acts of friendship and understanding. Americans are taking a greater and greater interest in Australia. This is natural, because as our own frontiers are pushed back, the Australian Frontier appeals more and more to the pioneering spirit in many of us. So what kind of country is this?

First, Australia is a big country. It is about the same size as the U.S. without Alaska. This inevitably poses problems of transportation and communication which smaller countries do not experience. Also, a large part of it, especially toward the center, is arid, and Australia is not lucky like we are in having great mountain ranges to catch the rain clouds and feed large river systems. Some day, power, soil chemistry and other forms of science will turn much of these low rainfall areas to pastoral and agricultural use, and in some places this is already happening, but for the present the main importance of these arid areas lies in the minerals which are being discovered there. All this should be kept in mind when we hear talk about the urgent need to fill "the vast empty spaces."

Second, Australia is a young country. It was settled only 177 years ago, 181 years after the first settlers came to the U.S. This is a disadvantage in one way, because in early days labor was cheap and development costs low; on the other hand, Australia has been able to benefit from modern technological, scientific and engineering knowledge not available a century ago. Mistakes have been made and opportunities lost, but all things considered, I think Australia has done pretty well during her relatively short life.

Third, Australia has a small population. She has about 11½ million people, or about one-seventeenth of our population. This smallness of population and labor force in so large a country aggravates the problems of rapid development and creates competitive difficulties for Australian industries because of limited local markets. Because of these and other factors the Government has pursued a vigorous migration policy, as a result of which nearly 2½ million migrants—about ¼ of the total population—have settled in the country since the last war.

Although nearly all of these are from Britain and the rest of Europe, some have come from non-European countries. But most people say that there will always be substantial restrictions on the entry of non-Europeans, in order to preserve the traditional texture of the population and to protect Australian workers in their employment. I am talking here about permanent settlers, for there is virtually no restriction on the entry of tourists, businessmen, students and other visitors from any country.

Because Australia, like the U.S., was first settled by British people, Americans will immediately notice a similarity in atmosphere and way of life. There is the same language,

similar forms of representative government, freedom of speech and worship, similar laws and statutes, and similar ideas of right and wrong and fair play. Of course there are differences, but an American in Australia does not feel bewildered, or frustrated or insecure, for he finds himself in a stable, orderly, and familiar environment.

Fourth, Australia is very near Asia. Australia is 12,000 miles from England and nearly 7,000 miles from California. But just beyond the northern borders in Australia's near north, are more than a billion people comprising many nations of different culture, history and background, most of them in the midst of great tumult and change.

The political and military significance of much of this is obvious, and Australian foreign policies take it into account. But this vast area to the north has another significance too. Given peace, and such assistance as Australia and others can offer, opportunities for trade and commerce could be tremendous too, and Australia is well situated to take advantage of this.

Fifth, Australia is a trading nation. Australia derives about 20% of its national income from foreign trade, compared to 6% for the United States. Notwithstanding her small population, Australia ranks among the top twelve trading nations in the world. Trade is her lifeblood.

Australia is the world's biggest exporter of wool, meat and lead; the second biggest exporter of wheat, sugar and zinc; the sixth biggest producer of gold; a large producer and exporter of iron ore, manganese, bauxite and coal. Substantial reserves of natural gas have been discovered and prospects for large finds of oil, which is already in commercial production, are favorable. Although Australia is often thought of abroad as an agricultural country, manufacturing is actually the largest single employer of labor. Proportionately to population, about the same percentage of the work force is employed in manufacturing as in the U.S.

The gross national product, about the fifth highest per capita in the world, is increasing at some 5% a year. About 25% of this is reinvested, but this does not begin to take care of the capital needs, for Australia's rapid development requires vast inflows of capital from abroad, just as was the case with the U.S. in the Nineteenth Century.

The pattern of Australia's trade is changing significantly. Australia's traditional trading partner and supplier of capital and "know-how" has been Britain. While the British ties are still important, links with America and the Asian countries have grown at a startling rate. For instance, although in the early fifties Britain accounted for nearly half of Australia's imports, today it is down to just over half that percentage. On the export side, after the war, Britain took more than 40% of Australia's exports; now the proportion is below 20%. These major reductions have occurred when Australia's total overseas trade has increased by over 50% since 1950.

The biggest single development since the war has been the emergence of Japan as the likely replacement for Britain as Australia's chief trading partner. With Japan's rapid economic growth, she is now the largest buyer of Australian raw wool, coal and iron ore, and it is evident that the Australian and Japanese economies will become increasingly inter-dependent.

Australia's relations with the U.S. are good. The common vital interests of both countries are clear. The U.S. and Australia are joined not only by the Seato and Anzus Treaties, but through intimate everyday co-operation at all levels. Australian troops are fighting alongside our own in Vietnam. In fact, the U.S. has no better friend in the world than Australia.

Australia now has a commitment to Vietnam of 4,500 troops. With our ever increasing commitment numbering about 250,000, their own troop strength may sound small. However, don't forget that there are seventeen Americans to every Australian and that one of the scarcest resources in Australia is manpower. I have talked to many Americans who have fought in Vietnam. Many times I have been told that American soldiers feel high confidence for their Australian comrades. The best policy in the world is to stay out of trouble, and that is our nation's policy, but if a fight comes looking for you, it is good to have Australia fighting beside you.

Over the widest possible range of political and military subjects the United States and Australia engage in frank, intimate and continuing consultation and discussion. The truly great and enduring alliances are based on mutual interest and mutual respect. This is the sort of alliance we have with Australia, and politically and militarily it leaves nothing to be desired.

On the trading side, there are some problems, although not serious ones. Australia is at present America's fastest growing export market, and she is a heavy buyer of U.S. military equipment. Last year about 24% of Australia's imports came from the United States, but only about 10% of her exports entered the United States. The Australians point out that we are the only major country to impose a tariff on raw wool, which we do at the high rate of 25½ cents per pound; and that their capacity to buy is hampered by other U.S. restrictions on imports such as those on meat and dairy products. But these and other problems are frankly faced by both parties and do not jeopardize the basic friendship which we enjoy.

Finally, Australia is a free enterprise country. Australia's wealth and progress are derived mostly from private enterprise. Nearly 80% of the work force is employed in non-governmental activity. But, because of historical factors and special circumstances, Australians have accepted the role of government in some fields where it does not participate in the United States.

Take the railways, which are owned either by the Commonwealth or the State Governments. In the early days the wool and wheat and produce had to be transported to the coast, but distances were so great and population so small and scattered that private enterprise would not and could not be expected to build railways; so governments had to build them.

Then again, the Australian economy is vulnerable, because it depends so much on circumstances beyond the country's control, such as variations in world prices for primary products, and natural disasters such as drought. Just recently prolonged and severe drought has caused Australia the loss of about 20 million sheep, 1½ million cattle and nearly a third of the wheat harvest.

In these circumstances the government has been active in encouraging and even creating diversity of production; and sometimes it has had to take uncomfortable fiscal and financial measures, through export and import controls, central bank variations in interest rates and lending policy. Like us in the United States, most Australians recognize the necessity for a reasonable amount of government regulation to keep the economy in balance.

I have painted a picture of a country where Americans feel at home, but where they face new and interesting challenges. Although Australia is a foreign country, it is not alien and inhospitable. Above all, Australia is a reliable country. Australia is a friend.